UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,319	12/31/2003	Omar Farooq Sayed	4410-9US	4680

33717   7590   04/04/2008
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP (LA)
2450 COLORADO AVENUE, SUITE 400E
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404

EXAMINER
SHIN, KYUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 December 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Application file date is 12/31/2003. Claims 1 - 25 are pending. Claims 1, 18, 19,

20 have been amended with newly added claims 23 – 25. Independent claims are 1, 18,

19, 20, 23.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 25 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 18 is objected to because of the following reason: Limitations after

'comprising a computer for:' are considered intended use, which is not given weight

when it simply expresses a general purpose of computer. (see MPEP 2111.04)

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 1 – 17, 18, 19, 20 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,

as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains

subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure

for "storing both the existing computer network directory and the new computer network

directory. The specification on page 9, line 16 states "Directory 106 may be stored in a

conventional database." Figures 1, 2 indicate a directory 106 but only one entry for a

directory. There is no disclosure for the storage of the directory information for two

unique states as amended in claims 1, 18, 19, 20. The new computer directory is a

subset of the entities in the "existing" (initial) computer network directory. The

specification on page 1, lines 13-15 states "using portions of the data for an existing

computer network directory of a master entity to provide a new customized computer

network directory for a subordinate entity".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. In claim 19, "…the program product

comprising computer readable program code.. " is to be construed as a computer

program per se, unless the application makes clear that the only reasonable

interpretation of the word " computer program " is a product that includes code set forth

on a tangible computer-readable medium. Thus, the broadest reasonable interpretation

of the claim would be that it includes only the program per se (code alone). As such, the

claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore **non-statutory**.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Regarding Claim 18, Vittal discloses intended usage for a general purpose of

computer as indicated in the Claim Objections. (col 2, ll 30-36: computer implemented

methods; col 6, ll 45-49: computer system; software implementation of portal switch

(merchant information aggregation); computer system for implementation of limitations)

Vittal teaches a computer system for using an existing computer network directory of a

first plurality of providers associated with a master entity to create a new computer

network directory of a second plurality of providers associated with a subordinate entity,

the method comprising:

    a) establishing computer communications between the master entity and the

        subordinate entity;

    b) defining a customization model;

   c) using the existing computer network directory and the customization model to

      create the new computer network directory;

   d) <u>storing both the existing computer network directory and the new computer</u>

      <u>network directory;</u>

   e) assigning an identifier corresponding to the subordinate entity; and

   f) embedding, under computer control of the master entity, the identifier into at least

a portion of the new computer network directory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7.   Claims **1 – 17, 19 - 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Vittal et al.** (US patent No. **6,907,401**) in view of **Feathers et al.** (US

PGPUB No. **20020055933**) and further in view of **Calver** (US PGPUB No.

20010032092).

Regarding Claims 1, 19, Vittal discloses a method, computer program product for

using an existing computer network directory of a first plurality of providers associated

with a master entity to create a new computer network directory of a second plurality of

providers associated with a subordinate entity, the method comprising:

   a) establishing computer communications between the master entity and the

      subordinate entity; (Vittal col 4, l 63 - col 5, l 15: communications (network,

Internet) between aggregator, merchants (providers), and customers; col 5, ll 17-

37: portal-merchant link, data may flow and be controlled by portal switch; portal-

merchant link allows participation of merchants in on-line buying and selling of

goods and services; portal-merchant link to display information associated with

the merchant by portal; col 6, ll 45-49: software implementation of portal switch

(merchant information aggregation);

b) defining a customization model; (Vittal col 2, ll 53-58; col 6, ll 32-35; col 8, ll 35-

64: merchant to set portal switch to specify services and data including upload

option, transfer format, pricing option, shopping option, data distribution;

customization capability for merchant (provider) information displayed to

customer (user))

c) using the existing computer network directory and the customization model to

create the new computer network directory; (Vittal col 4, ll 19-22: new directory

(total number of vendors minus vendors with switch disabled (new computer

directory, subset of total number of vendors available), customization model

allows merchant (provider) to customize information displayed to customer

(user); The new computer directory is a subset of the entities in the "existing"

(initial) computer network directory.   The specification on page 1, lines 13-15

states "using portions of the data for an existing computer network directory of a

master entity to provide a new customized computer network directory for a

subordinate entity".)

Vittal discloses the storage of data and information. (Vittal Figure 2; 3: database;

col 15, ll 1-10: preference file to be used to allocate files in which to store

participant's preferences; storage for each data structure (database information);

any changes written to a local file; specification on page 9 discloses storage of a

directory 106 (information) in a database)   Vittal does not explicitly disclose the

storing of directory information in a database.

However, Calver discloses:

d) storing both the existing computer network directory and the new computer

     network directory; (Calver para 020, ll 1-4: portal for deliver of information to

     customers; para 0118, ll 1-5; para 0118, ll 7-10: store information in a database;

     specification on page 9 discloses storage of directory (information) in a

     database))

    Vittal-Calver does not explicitly disclose identifiers for aggregator (master entity)

and merchants (providers, subordinate entities)

 However, Feathers discloses:

e) assigning an identifier corresponding to the subordinate entity; (Feathers para

     030, ll 14-20: identifier for merchant (subordinate entity, provider)) and

f) embedding, under computer control of the master entity, the identifier into at least

     a portion of the new computer network directory. (Feathers para 019, ll 14-17:

     identifier embedded with URL information for aggregator (master entity))

         It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal for

the storing of directory information in a database as taught by Calver, and to assign

an identifier for master entity and subordinate entity, and embed master entity

identifier in network directory information as taught by Feathers.   One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Calver in order

to provide valuable financial, marketing, and business development information

while attracting increasing numbers of small businesses to the overall electronic

commerce environment.   (Calver para 016, lines 5-9: " ... *Such a portal, if*

implemented properly, could provide valuable financial, marketing, and business

development information to small business, while attracting increasing numbers of

small businesses to the electronic commerce environment. ... "), and to employ the

teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to dynamically maintain web

site associations by maintaining a referring source's identification information to a

user's web site and preventing its lost (Feathers para 002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23).

Regarding Claim 2, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the second plurality

of providers is a subset of the first plurality of providers. (Vittal col 4, ll 19-22; col 3, ll 8-

15: merchant utilizes portal switch to dynamically participate or not participate in

directory information, current set of providers equal to total set of providers minus

providers currently not participating, subset of total providers)

Regarding Claim 3, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the first plurality of

providers offers goods, services or both goods and services. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 3, ll

38-40: provide onl goods and services)

Regarding Claim 4, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 wherein each of the first plurality of providers is associated in the existing computer network directory with a network location. (Vittal col 4, ll 47-50: portal, user interface consists of links (network location) to merchants (providers); col 5, ll 2-4; col 5, ll 9-15: each merchant (provider) network accessible to customers and aggregators)

Regarding Claim 5, Vittal discloses the method of claim 4 wherein each of the second plurality of providers is associated in the new computer network directory with a network location. (Vittal col 4, ll 47-50: portal, user interface consisting of links (network locations) to current set of merchants (providers); col 5, ll 2-4; col 5, ll 9-15: subset of merchants (providers) network accessible to customers and aggregators)

Regarding Claim 6, Vittal discloses the method of claim 5 further comprising referring potential customers to one or more of the second plurality of providers by passing linking information for each of the one or more of the second plurality of providers through a hosting server controlled by the master entity. (Vittal col 6, ll 45-49: portal software operational on server (master entity) system)

Regarding Claim 7, Vittal discloses the method of claim 6 wherein network location information for one or more of the first plurality of providers is copied at least in part to the new computer network directory. (Vittal col 4, ll 19-22; col 4, ll 47-50: network

location information included (dynamically added to listing of merchants) by participation

of merchant)

Regarding Claim 8, Vittal discloses the method of claim 4 wherein each of the first

plurality of providers is associated in the existing computer network directory with a

unique network location identified by a uniform resource locator. (Vittal col 4, ll 47-50:

URL link interface to merchant sites (network locations))

Regarding Claim 9, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising providing

a server controlled by the master entity and wherein defining the customization model

comprises accessing the server by the subordinate entity to define the customization

model. (Vittal col 8, ll 35-64: merchant (providers) access aggregator (master entity)

interface to customize information; col 6, ll 45-49: server system controlled by

aggregator with portal software)

Regarding Claim 10, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 3,

ll 38-40: provide onl goods and services)   Vittal does not specifically disclose whereby

a contractual duty to share at least a portion of its revenue with the master entity.

However, Feathers discloses wherein each of the first plurality of providers has a

contractual duty to share at least a portion of its revenue with the master entity.

(Feathers para 013, ll 10-16; para 015, ll 8-13: agreement (contractual) for revenue

sharing between aggregator (affiliate site, master entity) and merchant (provider))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability for revenue sharing between aggregator

(master entity) and merchants (providers).   One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost.   (Feathers para

002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

Regarding Claim 11, Vittal discloses the method of claim 10. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 3,

ll 38-40: provide only goods and services)   Vittal does not specifically disclose whereby

one or more of the second plurality of providers has a contractual duty to share a least a

portion of revenue with the subordinate entity. However, Feathers discloses wherein

one or more of the second plurality of providers has a contractual duty to share a least a

portion of revenue with the subordinate entity. (Feathers para 013, ll 10-16; para 015, ll

8-13: agreement (contractual) for revenue sharing between aggregator (affiliate site,

master entity) and merchants (providers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability for revenue sharing between aggregator

(master entity) and merchants (providers).   One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost.   (Feathers col 2, ll

2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

Regarding Claim 12, Vittal discloses the method of claim 11. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 3,

ll 38-40: provide only goods and services)   Vittal does not specifically disclose whereby

the portion of revenue of the one or more second plurality of providers is established by

the contractual relationship of the master entity with the first plurality of providers.

However, Feathers discloses wherein the portion of revenue of the one or more second

plurality of providers is established by the contractual relationship of the master entity

with the first plurality of providers. (Feathers para 013, ll 10-16; para 015, ll 8-13:

agreement (contract), revenue sharing between aggregator (affiliate site, master entity)

and merchants (providers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability for revenue sharing between aggregator

(master entity) and merchants (providers).   One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost.   (Feathers para

002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

Regarding Claim 13, Vittal discloses the method of claim 11. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 3,

ll 38-40: provide only goods and services)   Vittal does not specifically disclose whereby

sending revenue from the master entity to the subordinate entity corresponding to the

portion of revenue of the one or more second plurality of providers. However, Feathers

discloses wherein further comprising sending revenue from the master entity to the

subordinate entity corresponding to the portion of revenue of the one or more second

plurality of providers. (Feathers para 013, ll 10-16; para 015, ll 8-13: revenue sharing

between aggregator (affiliate site, master entity) and merchants (providers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability for revenue sharing between aggregator

(master entity) and merchants (providers). One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost. (Feathers para

002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

Regarding Claim 14, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the new computer

network directory is configured to provide a directory of merchants for only shopping by

customers. (Vittal col 1, ll 6-10; col 4, ll 41-47: only selling of goods and services by

merchants (providers), subset of merchants (new directory) designated by port switch

participation)

Regarding Claim 15, Vittal discloses the method of claim 14 wherein defining the

customization model comprises selecting by the subordinate entity of product categories

to use in copying selected data from the existing computer network directory. (Vittal col

8, ll 35-64: merchant (provider) determines information to be displayed at aggregator

(portal, master entity) site for customer (user))

Regarding Claim 16, Vittal discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising providing

an onl shopping environment for customers using the new computer network directory

wherein customers may select a merchant from the new computer network directory for

making a purchase. (Vittal col 13, ll 57-62; col 8, ll 56-63: users (customers) may

purchase items (using shopping cart) from directory (list of merchants))

Regarding Claim 17, Vittal discloses the method of claim 16 wherein (i) the only

shopping environment comprises a user interface and (ii) defining the customization

model comprises defining conditional rules; and the method further comprising

dynamically updating the user interface based on the conditional rules. (Vittal col 2, ll

53-68; col 8, ll 35-64: user interface for merchants (providers) to customized information

displayed at portal website)

Regarding Claim 20, Vittal discloses a method for tracking referrals from a plurality of

subordinate entities, wherein each of the plurality of subordinate entities markets to

customers using a new computer network directory generated from selected portions of

an existing computer network directory, wherein the existing computer network directory

comprises a list of a first plurality of providers associated with a master entity, and

wherein the new computer network directory comprises a list of a second plurality of providers associated with a subordinate entity, the method comprising:

a) defining a customization model; (Vittal col 2, ll 53-58; col 6, ll 32-35; col 8, ll 35-64: customization capability for merchant (provider) information displayed to customer (user))

b) using portions of data from the existing computer network directory as governed by the customization model to create the new computer network directory; (Vittal col 4, ll 19-22: new directory (total number of vendors minus vendors with switch disabled (new computer directory, subset of total number of vendors available), customization model allows merchant (provider) to customize information displayed to customer (user))

Vittal does not specifically disclose whereby an identifier for the aggregator (master entity) and merchants (providers).

However, Feathers discloses:

c) assigning, by the master entity, a master identifier corresponding to the subordinate entity; (Feathers para 019, ll 14-17: aggregator (master entity) identifier)

d) assigning, by each of the second plurality of providers, a provider identifier corresponding to the subordinate entity; (Feathers para 030, ll 14-20: a merchant (provider, subordinate entity) identifier) and

e) maintaining an association, by the master entity, between the master identifier

and each provider identifier assigned by the second plurality of providers to track

referrals from the subordinate entity. (Feathers para 020, ll 1-12; para 021, ll 11-

31: track referral information between aggregator (portal, master entity) and

merchants (providers), to ensure association between aggregator (master entity)

and merchant (provider))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability to assign an identifier for master entity

and provider. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ

the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to dynamically maintain

web site associations by maintaining a referring source's identification information to

a user's web site and preventing its lost. (Feathers para 002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-

23)

Regarding Claim 21, Vittal discloses the method of claim 20 further comprising

embedding, under computer control of the master entity, the master identifier into at

least a portion of the new computer network directory. (Feathers para 019, ll 14-17:

aggregator (master entity) identifier embedded in URL (directory) information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability to assign an identifier, and embed identifier

in network directory information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost.   (Feathers para

002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

Regarding Claim 22, Vittal discloses the method of claim 21 wherein the embedding

comprises embedding the master identifier into one or more links of a shopping mall

website based on the new computer network directory. (Vittal para 019, ll 14-17:

aggregator (master entity) identifier embedded in URL information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability to assign an identifier, and embed identifier

in network directory information.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to employ the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to

dynamically maintain web site associations by maintaining a referring source's

identification information to a user's web site and preventing its lost.   (Feathers para

002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-23)

8.   Claims **23 - 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vittal et al. (US patent No. **6,907,401**) in view of **Feathers et al.** (US PGPUB No.

20020055933).

Regarding Claim 23, Vittal discloses <u>a method for using an existing computer network</u>

<u>directory of a first plurality of providers associated with a master entity to create a new</u>

computer network directory of a second plurality of providers associated with a

subordinate entity, the method comprising:

a) establishing computer communications between the master entity and the

subordinate (Vittal col 4, l 63 - col 5, l 15: communications (network, Internet,

telephone ll, cable modems, satellite links) between aggregator, merchants

(providers), and customers; col 6, ll 45-49: software implementation of portal

switch (merchant information aggregation))

b) defining at least one rule to characterize an on-l shopping mall; (Vittal col 2, ll 53-

58; col 6, ll 32-35; col 8, ll 35-64: customization capability for merchant (provider)

information displayed to customer (user))

c) using the existing computer network directory and the at least one rule to create

the new computer network directory; (Vittal col 4, ll 19-22: new directory (total

number of vendors minus vendors with switch disabled (new computer directory,

subset of total number of vendors available), customization model allows

merchant (provider) to customize information displayed to customer (user))

Vittal does not specifically disclose identifiers for aggregator (master entity) and

merchants (providers, subordinate entities)

However, Feathers discloses:

d) assigning an identifier corresponding to the subordinate entity; (Feathers para

030, ll 14-20: identifier for merchant (subordinate entity, provider)) and

e) embedding, under computer control of the master entity, the identifier into at least

a portion of the new computer network directory. (Feathers para 019, ll 14-17:

identifier embedded with URL information for aggregator (master entity))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vittal as

taught by Feathers to enable the capability to assign an identifier for master entity

and subordinate entity, and embed master entity identifier in network directory

information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ

the teachings of Feathers in order to enable the capability to dynamically maintain

web site associations by maintaining a referring source's identification information to

a user's web site and preventing its lost. (Feathers para 002, ll 2-3; para 004, ll 19-

23)

Regarding Claim 24, Vittal discloses the method of claim 23 wherein one of the at least

one rule comprises a product category. (Vittal col 8, ll 43-45: disclose information to the

user related to pricing of a product (product category))

Regarding Claim 25, Vittal discloses the method of claim 23 wherein one of the at least

one rule comprises featured merchants. (Vittal col 8, ll 56-58: allow merchant (a

featured merchant) to specify the shopping options available to the user)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KYUNG H. SHIN whose telephone number is (571)272-

3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan J. FLYNN can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyung Hye Shin
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
3/23/2008
\

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154